

REMARKS

In the Office Action, claims 36 and 37 were indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form to include limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating the allowability of these claims. Claim 36 has been incorporated into independent claim 22 from which it directly depends, and the dependency of claim 37 has been changed from claim 36 to claim 22. Accordingly, claim 22 and dependent claims 23-35, 37 should be in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-10, 13-35 and 38-39 were rejected. By this Reply and Amendment, claims 22, 34 and 37 have been amended, claims 1-21, 28, 33, 35, 36, 38 and 39 have been canceled without prejudice, and claims 22-27, 29-32, 34 and 37 remain pending in the present application. All claim amendments are fully supported throughout the description and figures of the specification. No new matter has been added.

In the Office Action, claims 22-37 were rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph. It was stated that the specification was unclear as to how the sensors are connected to a plurality of sensing locations by a snorkel line. Accordingly, independent claim 22 has been amended to clarify the claim language regarding the connection of one or more sensors to a plurality of sensing locations. Claim 22 now specifically recites that at least one connection between a sensor and a sensing location is by a dedicated snorkel line. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 22-37 also were objected to based on the recitation "adapted to measure a characteristic of a supply" found in claim 22. Accordingly, claim 22 has been amended to clearly recite the sensor system has one or more sensors "to measure" a characteristic of the

supply and "to measure" the characteristic in or near a downhole tool. The amendment is believed to follow the Examiner's suggestion, and the objection should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-15, 20 and 21 were rejected under 35 USC 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. This rejection is strongly traversed, however claims 1-15, 20 and 21 have been canceled without prejudice and the rejection is now moot.

Claims 22, 24, 25, 27, 29-33, 35, 38 and 39 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by the Tubel et al. reference, US Publication No.: 2003/0131990. This rejection is respectfully traversed. However, the rejection is moot due to the incorporation of allowable claim 36 into independent claim 22 from which it directly depends.

Claims 1-10, 13-21, 26, 28 and 34 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over the Tubel et al. reference in view of the Schultz et al. reference, US Publication No.: 2004/0060696. This rejection is respectfully traversed. However, the rejection is moot because claims 1-10 and 13-21 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 26, 28 and 34 ultimately depend from allowable claim 22.

Claims 23 and 36 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over the Tubel et al. reference. This rejection is respectfully traversed. However, the rejection is moot in light of the indication of allowable subject matter in claim 36 and the dependency of claim 23 on allowable claim 22.

In view of the foregoing remarks, the pending claims should be in condition for allowance. However, if the Examiner believes certain amendments are necessary to clarify the present claims or if the Examiner wishes to resolve other issues by way of a telephone conference, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert A. Van Someren
Reg. No. 36,038

Date: May 11, 2007

PO Box 2107
Cypress, TX 77410-2107
Voice: (281) 373-4369